

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	A	TTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/870,621	09/870,621 05/31/2001			Scott J. Broussard		AUS920010263US1 1785		
35617	7590	10/17/2006				EXAMINER		
DAFFER I	ICDANE	EIL LLP				-		
P.O. BOX 684908					_	·		
AUSTIN, TX 78768					<u> </u>	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief (37 CFR 41.37)

Application No.	Applicant(s)			
09/870,621	BROUSSARD, SCOTT J.			
Examiner	Art Unit	_		
Dennis G. Bonshock	2173			

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on 23 November 2004 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 41.37.

1205.	oid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file anamended brief or other appropriate correction (see MPEP 03) within ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer. NSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.
1. 🛛	The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 41.37(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2.	The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, (e.g., rejected, allowed, withdrawn, objected to, canceled), or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iii)).
3. 🗌	At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iv)).
4.	(a) The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters; and/or (b) the brief fails to: (1) identify, for each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately, every means plus function and step plus function under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, and/or (2) set forth the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v)).
5.	The brief does not contain a concise statement of each ground of rejection presented for review (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vi))
6.	The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on appeal (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii)).
7.	The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(viii)).
8.	The brief does not contain copies of the evidence submitted under 37 CFR 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or of any other evidence entered by the examiner and relied upon by appellant in the appeal , along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered by the examiner, as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(ix)).
9.	The brief does not contain copies of the decisions rendered by a court or the Board in the proceeding identified in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of the brief as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(x)).
10.🛛	Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):
	the Examiner's Answer mailed April 5,, 2005 is vacated.
	The Brief does not comply with the guidelines set forth for all appeal Briefs filed on or after September 13, 2004, which must be in compliance with the requirements under section 41.37(c). Specifically the Brief doesn't have the proper headings (it should have a "Summary of claimed subject matter" section (with sufficient reference to the specification

for all of the independent claims) instead of "Summary of Invention", it should not have an "Issues" or "Grouping of Claims" section, but rather include a "Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal" section). The Brief also does no include an "Evidence appendix" or a "Related proceedings appendix".

RAYMOND J. BAYERL